UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,430	04/19/2007	Claudio Bargheer	095309.58063US	7297
23911 CROWELL & I	7590 11/24/200 MORING LLP	EXAMINER		
	AL PROPERTY GROU	BROWN, PETER R		
P.O. BOX 14300 WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3636	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/587,430	BARGHEER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Peter R. Brown	3636				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 Au	aust 2008					
, <u> </u>	action is non-final.					
·=	, 					
•—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>14-26</u> is/are pending in the application.						
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>17-23</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	THOM CONSIGNATION.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) <u>14-16 and 24-26</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) \square objected to by the E	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite				

Application/Control Number: 10/587,430

Art Unit: 3636

Claims 14-16 and 24-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Page 2

In claim 14, line 12, "the rear side", lacks definite antecedent basis. Note that if corrected and positively recited, then claim 15 should recite "said rear side...".

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoeppler (DE 10046216).

Figure 1 appears to show structure as claimed, including a fan 11 in air duct opening 9, "heating element" 4, and shield 7. Note that an infrared radiator provides an element that produces hot air, and meets the claimed limitations.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14,16 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Mertens or Bogisch et al in view of Arold (DE 19949935).

Both Mertens (fig. 2) and Bogisch et al (figs. 6,7) show the use of headrests that have rear shield members associated therewith for various reasons. The patent to Arold (fig. 1) teaches the conventionality of utilizing a heating device within a headrest, which includes a duct, and air inlet opening with a grid 21, a heating element and fan, and an outlet opening arranged on a downward side of the headrest. In view of this suggestion, to have provided the headrests of Mertens or Bogisch et al with such a heating device, for adding to the comfort of the occupant, would have been an obvious modification to one with ordinary skill in the art.

Note that the mesh shown in figure 7 of Bogisch et al would have elastic properties, and the specific location of the intake opening is considered a matter of design choice.

Claim 15 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant's arguments filed August 1, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Contrary to applicant's arguments, the patent to Hoeppler does indeed meet the limitations of claim 14. While applicant argues that Hoeppler shows an "infrared radiator", such a device still produces hot air that is directed downwardly through the duct. The limitations of the claim are still met.

Page 4

Regarding the rejection under Mertens, Bogisch et al and Arold, it is noted that while applicant discusses the shortcomings of Mertens and Bogisch et al, there is no discussion of Arold. It is conceded that Mertens and Bogisch et al do not show heating elements in the headrests, however, it is the combination of the suggestion of Arold that is relied upon to provide a heater within the headrest and meet the claimed limitations, and no discussion of such has been set forth as to why such a combination would not be feasible. The advantages of such a combination are evident, and the motivation for such combination would provide greater comfort to the occupant by allowing heat to the head/neck area.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter R. Brown whose telephone number is 571-272-6853. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Peter R. Brown/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3636